DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 343 EA 017 839

AUTHOR Cooper, Carol M.; Jones, Edward V.
TITLE The State of the Art in Inservice Education. A Review of the Literature.
INSTITUTION George Mason Univ., Fairfax, Va. Div. of Continuing Education.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 62p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (9th, Orlando, FL, November 18-20, 1984).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Instructional Development; *Literature Reviews; *Program Administration; Program Descriptions; Program Development; Resource Allocation; *Staff Development; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews the literature pertaining to inservice education and summarizes its contents relating to several broad themes: planning and instructional concerns in inservice education, problems relating to administration and coordination of inservice programs, and elements common to successful programs. The literature of inservice describes a diverse range of staff development practices and problems, but reflects a general lack of consensus as to what should be done to assure the most productive allocation of available resources for effective inservice programs. In view of these limitations, this paper attempts to summarize what is known, and thereby identify more clearly what we do not know or have been unable to accomplish with respect to inservice education. (Author/TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258343

The State of the Art in Inservice Education

A Review of the Literature

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edward V. Jones
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 017 839

Prepared By:

The State University in Northern Virginia

Division of Continuing Education

George Mason University

THE STATE OF THE ART IN INSERVICE EDUCATION: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Carol M. Cooper
Program Specialist
Reading is Fundamental, Inc.
Washington, D. C.

Edward V. Jones
Inservice Education Coordinator
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

Spring 1984

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this monograph is to review the literature relevant to inservice education and to summarize its contents relating to several broad themes. These include planning and instructional concerns in inservice education, problems of coordination and other issues pertaining to the administration and planning of inservice, and elements common to successful programs.

To a considerable extent, this paper supports what the authors and many other school-based and university practitioners have long suspected. The literature of inservice describes a diversified range of staff development practices and problems but, in general, reflects a lack of consensus as to what should be done to assure the most productive allocation of available resources and the positive impacts of inservice programs. In view of these limitations, this paper is an effort to summarize what we know--and thereby also to identify more clearly what we do not know or have been unable to accomplish with respect to inservice education.

Since George Mason University's formal commitment to teacher inservice is relatively recent and because of the scarcity of systematic knowledge on this topic, it is important that GMU and Northern Virginia school divisions profit from the experience of other states and institutions. This project was undertaken in the hope that it would suggest some starting points for new initiatives in our region. We invite the reactions and comments of our readers.

The State of the Art in Inservice Education:
A Review of the Literature

I. Definitions and Interpretations

II. Purpose and Importance

III. Problems and Potential Solutions

A. Planning and Instructional Concerns

1. Lack of Teacher Involvement in Planning and Implementation
2. Irrelevance to Teacher Needs
3. Obligatory Nature
4. Distance From School Context
5. Emphasis on Teacher Deficits
6. Need to Incorporate Principles of Adult Learning
   a. Self-Directed Learning
   b. Experience Base of Adults
   c. Adult Developmental Stages
   d. Problem Centeredness in Adulthood
7. Further Considerations for Program Development
8. Needs Assessment
9. Program Goals
10. Instructional Formats
11. Resolution of Expectations
12. Follow-up and Evaluation
13. Incentives for Participants and Resource Persons

B. Problems of Coordination

1. Inservice as a Non-System
2. Low Priority Within School Divisions
3. Lack of Accountability
4. Need for Institutionalization

5. Roles in Inservice

6. Funding for Inservice

7. Statewide Plans and Collaborative Programs

8. Exemplary Approaches in Selected States

9. Planning for Change

C. Other Issues and Problems in Inservice Education

1. Research and Theory/Practice

2. Pre-Service/Inservice Continuum

3. Administrative Training

4. Collaborative Programs

IV. Elements Common to Successful Programs

A. General Features of Successful Inservice Activities

B. Further Insights

1. Importance of Follow-up

2. Team Teaching as a Mechanism for Inservice

3. The Role of the Principal

C. Pointers for Practitioners

V. Conclusion

The purpose of this monograph is to describe the state of the art in inservice education in public schools and to discuss its implications for potential relationships between schools and universities. As an overview, this paper presents varying definitions and interpretations of inservice, describes its purposes and importance, addresses a variety of issues in the field, and discusses a range of potential solutions to problems. Within this framework, essential elements common to effective inservice activities are outlined and a variety of innovative programs and plans for inservice and staff development are cited.

Definitions and Interpretations

Definitions of inservice education vary widely, most frequently in reflecting differing needs for professional improvement. Edelfelt (1979) defines inservice for teachers as "any professional development activity that a teacher undertakes singly or with other teachers after receiving her or his initial teaching certificate and after beginning professional practice " (p.4). He goes on to say that inservice education must be reconceptualized to be consistent with teachers' changing roles, and should include all professional educators in collaborative efforts for professional development and improvement of public school programs. Within this group, in addition to classroom teachers, Edelfelt includes school administrators, college and university faculty, state department of education personnel, and staffs of teachers' organizations.

The need for collaboration in inservice education is expressed by other writers as well. Blatt (1980) describes inservice as including all activities designed to help people who already work in the schools to work

more effectively. While Blatt acknowledges that the meaning of inservice is not usually restricted to "on-the-job" and that education does not equate to training, he contends nonetheless that inservice education refers primarily to on-the-job training.

School-focused descriptions of inservice education are also in common usage. According to Howey (1981), inservice activities focus on teachers' interests and needs and on school-wide interests and concerns. In this manner inservice education emphasizes program improvement through professional development in a variety of forms and formats. As enumerated in the March 1983 issue of Practical Applications of Research (Newsletter of Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research), the "context of inservice education tends to have at least five general modes," which can be briefly described as follows:

1. Job-embedded. This mode allows teachers to learn while actually on the job. Joyce and others (1976) describe the following four modes of job-embedded inservice: 1)committee work, 2)team teaching, 3) work with consultants, and 4) professional reading and curriculum analysis.

2. Job-related. This mode often takes the form of workshops where teachers work together with resource people to solve a problem of interest to the group. A variation of this mode is the teacher exchange, where a teacher is temporarily assigned to a different school to benefit from new ideas or new interactions with teachers who use different styles, strategies, or curricula in special programs.

3. Credential-oriented. This mode is used mainly by those seeking advanced certificates or degrees.

4. Professional organization-related. It is the responsibility of professional associations to accept some responsibility for their members remaining current in the relevant field of study.

> 4. Self-directed. This concept views teachers as self-motivated professionals who are interested in maintaining and improving their own skills through self-initiated activities. (pp. 2-3)

While the term inservice education has traditionally been employed to refer specifically to teachers' professional development activities, it has come increasingly to be used interchangeably with staff development, which is widely employed in other professions. The trend toward the use of the latter term is, in part, an effort to enhance the self-perception of the teaching profession by placing it on a par with other professions which offer and require continuing education for their members.

While specific definitions, focal points, and formats of inservice educatic vary, all reflect similar ultimate goals. In its many public school contexts, inservice is aimed at helping teachers to improve the quality of their students' learning experiences and to contribute to the well-being of public education and of society as a whole.

Purpose and Importance

In recent years, there has been a growing nationwide interest in the quality of inservice education (Harris, 1980). This emphasis, which developed in the 1970s, indicates increased understanding of the importance of inservice on the parts of parents, classroom teachers, administrators, boards, associations, legislators, and the general public. The consensus appears to be that necessary educational improvements can result only from increased knowledge and insights among those working in the schools. The belief that inservice education can be the main vehicle for this improvement is research supported. Lawrence (1974), for example, found that 80 percent of the 90 inservice programs which he studied were judged to have caused significant changes in teacher behavior (Harris, 1980).

Among those most interested in the quality of inservice education are parents. This group is applying increased pressure on teachers in the belief that student achievement is directly related to teacher competence, and that inservice education has the potential to increase that competence (Collins, 1981).

Rubin, citing Harris (1980), states that "teachers, as a whole, are remarkably open to new methodology--even hungry for it." Johnson (1980) reports that 69 percent of teachers surveyed in a 1976 national interview sample affirmed their need for inservice education.

Public appeals and legal mandates for accountability in education have inspired state and regional developments such as Teacher Corps, teacher centers, and regional education service centers (Harris, 1980). In addition, all states have now discontinued granting lifetime teaching certificates and are requiring teachers to participate in some level of continuing professional development (Toch, 1982).

The national emphasis on inservice education and staff development has received additional impetus from a variety of trends in different areas. Although both preservice and inservice education are important to the improvement of teaching, inservice education will assume a proportionately greater importance over the next decade. In recent years, the teaching profession has been characterized by growing stability and a decline in the availability of new positions in many geographic and content areas. As a result of this trend, Howell (1980) estimates that 70% of today's teachers will still be on the job in 1990. As the average tenure of teachers rises, and as the teaching profession comes increasingly to be staffed by older persons who are further and further removed from their preservice training, teachers will become increasingly

dependent upon inservice activities in order to remain current in their profession.

Due to the burgeoning "knowledge explosion" and availability of instructional technology, the need has perhaps never been greater to renew and refine teachers' knowledge of subject matter and teaching methodology (Toch, 1982). In addition, RIFed teachers and those in subject areas of low demand can benefit from inservice retraining which might give them a competitive advantage in seeking employment. Finally, inservice education must fill the void left by decreasing teacher turnover and by the scarcity in innovative methods and insights which were formerly assured by a continued large influx of newly trained teachers into the public schools (Johnson, 1980).

Rapidly changing social conditions make additional demands on schools and educational personnel (Collins, 1981). Inservice education has been employed to facilitate and communicate awareness about racial and sexual equality, bilingual/multicultural education, and issues related to problems of the handicapped (Johnson, 1980). Given the limits of preservice teacher preparation, inservice programs must continue to respond to social changes which have impacts on education. In addition, inservice education must address a variety of areas in which parents have tended increasingly to yield responsibility to the schools. These include such topics as drug education, sex education, parenthood training, moral development, nutrition education, life skills, and vocational guidance (Johnson, 1980).

Problems and Potential Solutions

Although it appears that inservice education will continue to grow in importance, sources in the field reveal many problems which must be

addressed. While some partial and potential solutions are also suggested, the nature of the literature in inservice education as a whole is rather episodic. Problems and solutions are seldom presented together except by implication. This section describes a series of problems identified by different sources and some potential solutions which may or may not have been addressed by the same writers. These issues are discussed below in three major categories: planning and instructional concerns in inservice education, problems of coordination, and other issues and problems.

Planning and Instructional Concerns

1. Lack of Teacher Involvement in Planning and Implementation. Although inservice education is most often focused upon classroom teachers, this group often is not consulted during goal setting and planning stages nor are they encouraged to initiate or to participate in the implementation of inservice programs. As a result, teachers' needs frequently go unaddressed, particularly those relating to personal/psychological development, which must be met in order for educators to perform effectively in their professional roles (Howey, 1981). This disregard of teachers' perceived needs often results in charges that inservice is irrelevant to teacher improvement (Edelfelt and Lawrence 1975; Houston, 1980; Toch, 1982; Williams, 1980).

2. Irrelevance to Teacher Needs. According to the results of surveys conducted in 1976 and 1978, inservice education often fails to address teachers' day-to-day needs, and is apt to be perceived as irrelevant, overly prescriptive, or lacking specific focus. Teachers typically complain that inservice courses are theoretical rather than practical

(Johnson, 1980). In a Tennessee study of 646 teachers from 13 school districts, 73 percent of the respondents felt that most inservice activities were not relevant to their classroom needs; almost one-third stated that the majority of these experiences were "virtually useless" (Harris, 1980).

Teachers are not the only group deprived by poorly designed inservice programs. Students and communities are disadvantaged as well (Williams, 1980). Parents, for example, despite their interest in the quality of teaching, are seldom consulted about inservice priorities or given input into planning (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975).

3. Obligatory Nature of Inservice. A compounding irony in the frequent irrelevance of inservice activities is the fact that many inservice programs are obligatory for participants (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975). Typically, these programs are both imposed and delivered by individuals and agencies far removed from teachers' classrooms including school boards, colleges and universities, consultants, administrators, and state departments of education (Johnson, 1980; Toch, 1982). Since teachers' salary increases and continued certification are often dependent on their participation in inservice credit programs, they may be forced to take courses they dislike and which provide them with little benefit (Toch, 1982). They must also participate on their own time and often at their own expense.

4. Distance From School Context. According to Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975), one of the most common complaints about inservice is its distance, both literally and figuratively, from public school environments. Again this is largely due to the influence of "authorities," rather than

teachers, in the design and implementation of programs. In describing the state of the art in inservice, these authors maintain that a strong pattern exists of university rather than school leadership in goal-setting and planning. This pattern is reflected not only in the focus of university courses, but in the selection of texts, teacher guides, and curriculum. Such university dominance tends to occur despite the desires of many teachers to work directly with their peers in the planning and development of inservice programs (Howey, 1981).

Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) state further that teacher preparation institutions and school districts generally do not collaborate in comprehensive planning of teachers' professional development. This tends to result in a separation, rather than a continuum between preservice and inservice education. This situation exists in part because many inservice instructors have had little or no recent exposure to public school classrooms, a circumstance which adds further weight to the charge that inservice programs tend to be irrelevant to teacher needs (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975; Howey, 1981). A further complication, and a recurring theme in the literature, is the fact that inservice education and curriculum development are rarely integrated (NCSIE, 1980). In this context Houston (1980) argues that inservice education has become an institutional response to institutionalized requirements or to prescriptive legislation, rather than an opportunity for educators to develop more effective instruction.

5. Emphasis on Teacher Deficits. Although there has been a shift towards continuous professional development and problem-solving in inservice education, the emphasis remains on remediating teachers' weaknesses,

rather than capitalizing on their strengths (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975; Williams, 1980). This conclusion is supported and reflected by the familiar pattern of an inservice instructor acting entirely as an information-giver, using lectures to deliver information with little or no regard for learner needs or objectives (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975). Blatt (1980) contends that university schools of education can promote teacher education by increasing their awareness that teaching should be flexible in format and that all of us, particularly teachers, are involved in both teaching and learning--in a variety of forms and formats--throughout life.

All of the practices discussed to this point reflect a lack of confidence in the professional judgment of teachers. Further, they imply that teachers should not be trusted with any significant responsibility for determining the content and methods of their own learning and professional development. This sort of inservice philosophy may indirectly foster teacher rigidity in dealing with children, an ironic predicament since this is one of the conditions inservice is supposedly intended to correct.

6. Need to Incorporate Principles of Adult Learning. Perhaps the most essential prerequisite for successful inservice education programs as suggested by the literature, and one which is often neglected in the planning of staff development activities, is that participants be treated as professionals and mature adults who want to continue to expand their skills and competence. Research findings on elements common to effective inservice programs indicate that established adult learning principles should be systematically incorporated into inservice activities. Adult

learning theorists have addressed student motivation and adaptation in learning processes as these are influenced by developmental changes occurring throughout the adult lifespan. Since adult learning activities must relate to the whole adult student as he/she is influenced by total patterns of life circumstances, staff development plans must reflect sensitivity to this issue (Warnat, 1979).

Malcolm Knowles has outlined four major components of andragogy, the "art and science" of adult learning, all of which have implications for planning inservice programs (Warnat, 1979). These include self-directed learning, the experience base of adult learners, adult developmental stages, and problem-centeredness in adulthood.

a. Self-Directed Learning. As the individual matures, there is a transition from total dependence to increasing self-directedness. As a result, adults prefer to plan and carry out their own learning experiences. Knox (1981) suggests that it is the responsibility of those who coordinate professional development activities to help practitioners with their own learning projects by providing both materials and other assistance to aid them in achieving their goals.

At present, some attention is being directed toward this need in the form of self-help instructional modules. Various inservice learning aids including worksheets, bibliographies, and other materials and activities have been designed to supplement video or television viewing and follow-up sessions (Parramore, 1980; Lumpkins et al, 1980). In general, multimedia presentations in inservice education have been judged more effective than activities relying entirely on the distribution of printed materials (Terry, 1980).

In addition to the use of audiovisual media to promote self-directed staff development activities, a number of states have developed networks to promote sharing of inservice information and resources (NCSIE, February, 1980). Some states and some local school districts have established school-based resource centers to facilitate self-directed staff development and other school improvement efforts (Collins, 1981). The Illinois Resource and Dissemination Network, for example, allows teachers access to research, methodology and other information on programs which relate specifically to their classroom needs (NCSIE, 1980).

b. Experience Base of Adults. The mature individual has accumulated a reservoir of experiences to use as learning resources (Warnat, 1979). All new learning builds on previous experience, including acquired attitudes, anxieties, and competencies. This experience base of adult learners challenges designers of inservice programs to plan activities which relate to each individual's conceptual framework and to accommodate and build upon the past experience of all participants.

The background and experience of adult learners often places them on a par with instructors, who in many instances serve most effectively as learning facilitators rather than as content experts (Massey, 1979). This issue should be carefully considered in the planning of inservice activities, especially since a frequently voiced complaint about inservice instructors is that they are condescending; they are perceived as treating teacher participants as inferiors. Because of these factors, many inservice activities fail to reach their full potential for helping teachers to improve professional knowledge and skills.

In recognition of adults' experience base, a number of innovative programs have been established in which experienced teachers use their

own expertise to help their fellow professionals. One of these, which also satisfies the need for individuals to direct their own learning, is the Vermont Resource Agent Program (RAP). This program provides a resource catalog of teachers who have dealt successfully with specific problems in teaching and who may be contacted directly and personally by others needing their advice (NCSIE, February, 1980). In addition, these teacher "experts" serve as leaders for thirty workshops, also listed in the catalog. Any individual or group of teachers may select a particular workshop, telephone a resource agent, and arrange a time and location for this inservice activity (Rubin, 1978). In a similar program, teachers adept at a particular instructional technology are made available to their peers as "roving consultants" (Rubin, 1978). Finally, in New York, teachers and principals at elementary through high school levels "teach" each other in order to share insights about public education for different age groups and to assure a more integrated school program (Gudridge, 1980).

c. Adult Developmental Stages. As individuals mature, their readiness to learn is increasingly related to developmental tasks which evolve from their social roles (Warnat, 1979). The point at which a learning opportunity coincides with the learner's recognition of the need for particular knowledge is what Havighurst (1961) calls the "teachable moment."

Traditionally, inservice education has focused on skills development and knowledge acquisition for educators who want to improve or upgrade their professional competencies. Because the majority of teachers participating in staff development activities range from 25 to 40 years

years of age and, for the most part, participate in few formal learning activities other than inservice, they are consistently approached as a homogeneous group who participate and respond in similar and predictable ways (Warnat, 1979). Research suggests, however, that only ten to twenty percent of adult learning is cognitive while the remainder occurs in the affective domain. The affective dimensions of personal/professional development, which relate closely to adult developmental concerns, are seldom addressed in inservice programs (Warnat, 1979). Few inservice programs relate at all to teachers' morale and commitment, primary areas of concern to many educators and to the education profession as a whole (NCSIE, 1980). As Reynolds and Howey (1980) observe, the teacher's need to grow as a person as well as a professional has not been recognized by teacher professional organizations, either as part of relicensing or recertification requirements. These writers emphasize that adult development theory is helpful not only in understanding teachers' content needs as inservice learners, but also in understanding their instructional behavior so that inservice activities may be planned more effectively to address classroom needs.

Reynolds and Howey (1980) suggest that inservice education should promote and exemplify close, personal, and cooperative working relationships among educators. Teams of teachers should be encouraged to work together and to provide feedback to each other on an ongoing basis. In addition, inservice education will contribute to more positive self-esteem among educators to the extent that it helps teachers to satisfy their personal and professional needs and, when necessary, to adjust and redefine their professional roles. One step in this direction would be the development of career profiles to provide teachers with outlines and/or guide-

lines to be used as reference materials. Hall and Loucks (1978) have published research relating to what they call the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), an inservice model which represents a continuum for teacher development. CBAM is summarized briefly in the March 1983 issue of Practical Applications of Research (Newsletter of Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research) as follows:

> The authors explain that teachers' concerns move through a series of developmental stages. The stages range from awareness (becoming knowledgeable about an innovation) to refocusing (seeking other possible innovations). Initially, they have more of a "self" focus to their concerns, then more of a "task" focus, and ultimately more of an "impact" focus. Through various diagnostic procedures, Hall and Loucks train staff developers, principals, and other change facilitators to identify these different concerns, and then to develop staff improvement programs that are consistent with the identified concerns (p.3).

d. Problem Centeredness in Adulthood. Knowles' fourth principle of andragogy is that as the adult matures, his or her learning focus changes from a subject-centered to a problem-centered orientation. For the most part, adult learning is focused upon present life activities rather than upon preparation for future roles, which means that individuals are seeking immediate application of learning to their present problems or circumstances (Warnat,1979).

One state which has demonstrated that teacher-initiated, problem-centered approaches to teacher education can be successful is Massachusetts. At the Commonwealth Institute for Inservice Education, voluntary programs are designed by and for school staffs to meet local needs. In this manner, meaningful and affordable inservice activities can be provided for teachers, administrators, parents, counselors, and/or paraprofessionals (NCSIE, February, 1980).

Another approach to problem-centered learning for educators is represented by teacher centers. These centers help to develop strategies and to provide materials to assist teachers in solving problems that they themselves have identified. They are products of collaboration among school divisions, state agencies, training institutions, teacher professional organizations, and communities as a whole (McKenzie, 1980). In Florida, for example, teacher centers contract for university services to provide short-term workshops (Drummond, 1980).

One further delivery system for problem-centered inservice education is represented by the "training of trainers" staff development model. In California, teams of administrators, teachers, aides, and volunteers have been trained in critical content areas and in the dynamics of transferring information, so that they may return to their local schools both to implement their own learning and to train others (Grossman, 1980).

7. Further Considerations for Inservice Program Development. In addition to the need that inservice programs for teachers be tailored to the nature of adults as learners, there are further program development issues which require attention. Due to the somewhat contradictory circumstances that inservice education is apt to be perceived as everyone's responsibility while it is often, in fact, nobody's assigned responsibility, coordination has tended to be informal or non-existent. Knox (1981) suggests that topics for teacher staff development activities have tended to be based upon program planners general (or at least perceived) familiarity with the needs of workshop participants, rather than upon formal needs assessments. In contrast, he advocates that inservice coordinators

should actively and formally assess educational needs, focus program objectives, attract participants and resource persons, and systematically evaluate both the process and impact of these efforts. Howey and Bents (1979) both reiterate and expand upon Knox's views in stating that the crucial elements of inservice education are needs assessment; incentives for participants; instructional format; documentation; and evaluation, governance, and management. The National Inservice Network's Quality Practices Task Force (1980) advocates a problem-solving approach to the design and implementation of inservice activities, focusing upon the identification of organizational, programmatic, and individual needs; planning and program management; and ongoing evaluation.

8. Needs Assessment for Inservice Education. Systematic needs assessment is essential to inservice planning. Rubin and Hansen (1980) indicate that problems and problem situations must be identified and translated into goals or desired training outcomes. These should then be prioritized, taking into account both present and future needs, before selection and planning of particular inservice activities (Rubin and Hansen, 1980). The latter have seldom received systematic attention in inservice planning.

As previously indicated, where needs assessments for inservice education have been conducted at all, they have tended to be unsystematic and highly subjective (Harris, 1980). A number of states now base their inservice efforts primarily upon achieving basic student competencies with little or no effort toward addressing specific teacher needs and concerns (NCSIE, 1980). Rubin and Hansen (1980) urge the use of several sources of both data and perspective gathering prior to the planning

of inservice programs. These include teachers, students, administrators, superintendents, and communities as a whole. Only through such comprehensive needs assessment procedures may inservice planners adequately identify the real needs of teachers and determine inservice priorities.

Florida is one state which has made a substantial effort to anticipate future social changes affecting public education and teachers' needs as a result of these changes. Predictions of future inservice needs are based upon projected shifts in the socio-economic status of families, parental expectations, administrative mechanisms, and requirements for responsible citizenship (Rubin, 1978).

9. Inservice Program Goals. Howey and Bents (1979) stress the relationship between inservice needs and program goals. They contend that needs assessments should address three primary areas which have impacts on teacher effectiveness: adult cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development; school environmental conditions; and instructional behavior. These areas must be considered together, since change in any one affects the others. The specific inservice goals of local school divisions as well as the delivery systems and instructional strategies employed for staff development then vary depending upon which area is accorded the highest priority.

10. Instructional Formats. Harris (1980) suggests that some important elements of inservice education planning are neglected in the literature. Especially important among these is the selection of instructional activities, which in conjunction with individual participants' informal interaction with people and materials, influence the impact of inservice programs.

Studies on "experience impact" suggest that teachers dislike inservice programs where they are required to sit and listen, but have positive

reactions to "make and take" workshops (Harris, 1980). At present, however, inservice teaching/learning activities consist primarily of reading, listening to presentations, and using technology such as videotape, audiotape, phone networks, and computers (Knox, 1981). Prevailing inservice instructional methods such as lectures, films, brainstorming and panels produce little experience impact because they do not rely extensively on the use of the different senses and because they tend to restrict interaction and involvement. Therefore, more innovative teaching/learning approaches including role-plays, buzz sessions, demonstrations, micro-teaching, and creative uses of technology are recommended to increase experience impact and overall effectiveness (Harris, 1980).

Depending on the nature and complexity of the learning expected, inservice activities may take a variety of forms. From lower to higher levels of complexity, learning objectives may address acquisition of information, skills development, decision-making abilities, management and leadership capabilities, concept development, or behavior change (Edelfelt, 1979). More complex or higher level learning objectives require activities with high experience impact and more face-to-face activity, thus necessitating smaller groups of participants. Less complex objectives may be achieved in larger groups relying upon activities with lower experience impact (Harris, 1980).

Content for inservice activities may include academic subject matter, subject-specific and general instructional techniques, and classroom management (Rubin, 1978). Within these areas, Blatt (1980) stresses that teachers should be encouraged to seek diversified resources, interpret current information, acquire new knowledge, and transfer knowledge to new situations.

Another important element to be considered in planning inservice programs is accessibility, with respect to both time and location. There should be a minimum of interference with the ongoing schedules of adult participants. When possible, inservice activities should be scheduled to take place during, rather than after working hours, and preferably at the work sites of participants (National Inservice Network, 1980).

11. Resolution of Expectations. A primary difficulty with many inservice programs is that planners, instructors and participants often have different expectations. Learners, in particular, may approach staff development activities with a great deal of ambivalence and uncertainty or, on the other hand, with very specific ideas about what and how they will learn. In many instances these assumptions are very different from those of inservice instructors and learning facilitators and from those of the administrators who arrange particular inservice activities. As a result, many potentially successful programs fail to produce positive results.

It is imperative that an instructor or learning facilitator resolve expectations and clarify ambiguity at the very beginning or, if possible, before the beginning, of each inservice program. Stubblefield (unpublished, 1974) suggests that this task may be approached in one of two ways. On the one hand, the instructor may invite participants to talk about what they expect to get out of their learning experience and how they expect to go about it. On the other hand, the instructor may simply tell participants what they will be expected to do and for what intended benefits. Often a combination of these approaches can be employed to best advantage. In any case, the instructor must deal openly with what participants want to

learn, how they want to learn, and the time which they have to learn. If learner expectations differ substantially from the planned program, then these differences have to be reconciled. Either provisions must be made to meet "unplanned expectations" or learners must be given reasons why their expectations cannot be met.

12. Follow-up and Evaluation of Inservice Programs. Evaluation of learning outcomes is one of the most neglected areas of inservice education but one of the most crucial to the success of inservice programs (National Inservice Network, 1980). A typical inservice evaluation instrument amounts to little more than a participant "happiness quotient," though as noted by Jones and Bolton (1981), participant happiness and participant learning are not always closely related. At the same time, teacher learning is not always translated into improvement of school programs.

Because of increasing stability in the teaching profession, Lorenz (1982) suggests that the impact of inservice "lessons" can now last longer than in the past. Nonetheless, reinforcement of inservice by on-the-job-follow-through occurs only rarely (Rubin, 1978; Howey and Bents, 1979). In a 1980 inservice survey, for example, only one in seven teachers reported any kind of follow-up to inservice offerings by program planners or instructors (Howey, 1981). Such lack of follow-up remains discouragingly widespread despite the results of a 1981 national study in which 70 percent of public school and university respondents felt that inservice participants should have access to support services to help them implement their inservice learning in their classrooms. Public school practitioners further believed that teachers who attempt to implement new learning

should be recognized for their efforts (Wood et al, 1982). In fact, such efforts tend not only to go unrewarded, but are often confronted with lack of support and skeptical reactions from school administrators.

There is, of course, no shortage of recommendations calling for more comprehensive follow-up and in-depth evaluation procedures for inservice programs. The National Inservice Network's Quality Practices Task Force recommended in 1980 that evaluation of inservice programs address planning, implementation, and dissemination, focusing upon both short and long term goals. Knox (1981) urges that both process and impact evaluation be employed and NIN (1980) stresses that students' perceptions of inservice impacts should be included as part of any impact evaluation effort. Howey and Bents (1979) recommend the examination of verbal and nonverbal behavior; skill, knowledge, and behavior change; and transfer of training, through ethnographic analyses as well as structured instrumentation follow-up.

How we can determine the effectiveness of inservice programs is a complicated issue beyond the scope of this paper. It may be helpful, however, to identify a few themes which might guide this undertaking. Baden (1982) suggests that evaluation concerns for inservice educators can be "approached" through the following five questions:

1. Was the content of the inservice activity informative and useful to the participants?
2. Was the presenter of the inservice activity effective?
3. Did the participants in the inservice activity exhibit the behavior change defined by the objectives?
4. Did the participants' behavior in their classrooms change as a result of the inservice activity after a period of time?

5. Did the students of the participants change as a result of altered teachers' behavior?

These questions and an accompanying matrix (see page 23) provide a foundation for the evaluation of inservice programs which, as Baden indicates, "must be tied to an approach to the professional development of educators which involves needs assessment, the setting of measurable objectives, and the delivery of services tied specifically to objectives" (p. 47).

13. Incentives for Participants and Resource Persons. Inservice planners must make more concerted efforts to attract both participants and qualified resource persons. Knox (1981) observes that, in contrast to extensive marketing efforts which are often conducted in other professional fields, inservice teacher education tends to rely on more informal announcements such as bulletins and brochures. He suggests that the compulsory nature of inservice may discourage the use of more aggressive marketing strategies which are employed in fields where staff development is voluntary.

According to Howey and Bents (1979), incentives for inservice participants are both extrinsic and intrinsic, and include economic benefits, increased knowledge or skills, the prospect of improved working conditions, increased support, and self-awareness. Though stipends and salary increases occasionally result from inservice participation, the more common motivation for teachers is credit which may be applied to recertification. Because of the educational backgrounds and salary levels of today's more experienced teachers, traditional rewards for inservice participation may no longer be sufficient, and thus more innovative ways of encouraging tenured teachers to participate in inservice must be developed (Johnson et al, 1982;Johnson,1980).

EVALUATION CONCERNS IN INSERVICE EDUCATION

Evaluation Concern	Purpose	Administered To Whom	When Administered	Results Sought	When Administered	Type of Instrument
Content of inservice activity	Ascertain if content presented met desired objectives	Participants by planners	Conclusion of inservice activity	Participant assessement of content effectiveness	On site of activity	Likert-type Checklist
Presenter of inservice activity		Participants by planners	Conclusion of inservice activity	Participant assessment of presenter	On site of activity	Checklist
Participant learning: immediate	Determine whether participants achieved objectives	Participants by presenter	Conclusion of inservice activity	Participant behavior change	On site of activity	Varied based on objectives
Participant learning: long-term	Determine whether behavior change remains after period of time	Participants by self, peers, or students	Minimum of two months after activity	Participant behavior change	In participant classroom	Varied based on objectives
Student learning	Determine whether students of participants change behavior as result of teacher	Participants by self, peers, or students	Before & after teacher behavior change introduced into classroom	Student behavior change	In participant classroom	1.Classroom environment observation 2.Checklist 3.Objective referenced

From: Baden, D. J. (1982). A user's guide to the evaluation of staff development. In F. J. McDonald, W. J. Popham, and D. J. Baden, Assessing the Impact of Staff Development Programs (pp. 37-47). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

As one step toward addressing this problem, field-based master's degree programs have been developed at a number of colleges and universities. These programs are designed to correlate theory with practice, thus addressing the criticism that inservice is overly theoretical (NCSIE, 1980; Christensen and Migra, 1981).

An example of one such masters program, at Old Dominion University in Virginia, uses the school, rather than the individual, as a unit for inservice education. After a school is admitted into the program, its entire staff can participate over a three year period. A "seminar strand" provides the opportunity for teachers to assess and actively work toward improving specific school problems. A "competency strand" enables each teacher to work with an individual advisor on a personal improvement project which is both supportive of school change and worthy of academic credit. In describing the ODU program, Allen (1980) maintains that such an arrangement remedies the well documented inservice problem of teachers returning from inservice training to school environments which do not support what they have learned.

Though the issue of incentives for university personnel to serve as instructors is discussed in a later section of this paper, several plans for motivation will be mentioned at this point. A survey of 99 deans of university schools of education reveals differences in commitment to immediate and long-term rewards. Although 77 schools provided inservice-involved faculty with additional compensation, and 52 reduced regular faculty teaching loads, the results indicate that "only in theory" are faculty rewarded for inservice teaching in terms of reappointment, promotion, or tenure (Seldin, 1981). This same survey suggests that

for a university to be an effective "enabler" of inservice programs requires the establishment of an office and a director to coordinate such programs, external funding, and increased faculty rewards. For faculty load purposes, respondents favored counting one credit of inservice activity as equivalent to one and one-half on-campus credits, and advocated that non-credit-bearing inservice be tabulated in equivalency terms as well.

Some states and universities have developed innovative ways of rewarding inservice activities. In Florida, colleges and universities receive state funds to support faculty salaries if that money is devoted to noncredit inservice work with school districts, such as in teacher centers (Gudridge, 1980). At some universities in other states faculty may be paid overload salaries for consultative services such as inservice teaching. When laboratories or other university facilities are used for inservice programs, a "sponsor's fee" may be arranged to reimburse the appropriate departments (Larsen, 1981).

Southern Illinois University faculty receive both immediate and long term service rewards for participation in inservice activities. Inservice involvement is documented in Professional Service Units (PSUs) which are awarded at the rate of one PSU per contact hour. PSUs are then tabulated in a manner that allows inservice participation to be credited along with campus teaching. SIU faculty also receive long term compensation through annual salary increases and tenure and promotion plans (Baden 1982).

Problems of Coordination in Inservice Education

In addition to the preceding planning and instructional issues, inservice education confronts a number of coordination problems. Some of these are discussed below.

1. Inservice as a Non-system. One of the most apparent problems in inservice education is the lack of a coordinated system for school and teacher improvement. Inservice has been characterized as a non-system which is piecemeal, sporadic, event oriented, and offered in cafeteria style. Koelling (1981) completes his indictment by comparing inservice to a voucher plan through which a school division (or other agency) is funded and then looks around for an agency or individuals to provide services.

Johnson (1980) describes inservice education as fragmented and devoid of a conceptual framework. She suggests that inservice activities are not integrated, nor are they based upon assessed needs. Many school divisions offer (or facilitate for their staff members) a disorganized patchwork of miscellaneous workshops, lectures, and college courses (Toch, 1982). These are usually designed primarily to meet school board regulations and state certification requirements rather than to address teachers' immediate concerns, and they are frequently backed by only minimal resources. Houston (1980) indicates that most school divisions designate less than one percent of their budgets specifically to staff development for teachers.

The disorganized nature of inservice education is especially apparent in the lack of integration of professional improvement of teachers, supposedly the objective of recertification requirements, and any coherent plan for the improvement of schools (Howey, 1981). This lack of relationship between staff and organizational development often results in inservice programs with little potency and no lasting impact. Not surprisingly, such activities are typically disdained by teachers (Toch,

1982) and are often neglected altogether except when they provide credit needed for recertification or are otherwise prerequisites for continued employment.

2. Low Priority of Inservice Education Within School Divisions. As observed by Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975), the disorganized nature of many inservice efforts is both a cause and an effect of the lack of comprehensive planning and the absence of systematic school-based staff development programs. This reflects a low administrative priority for quality staff development programs, which has become increasingly evident to teachers. Despite various public acknowledgements of the importance of inservice education by school administrators and others, surveys continue to suggest that teachers perceive little administrative emphasis on improving teacher classroom performance or on teacher professional development programs (Johnson, 1980). Furthermore, while every large school division annually conducts a wide variety of staff development activities, the typical individual teacher in most schools receives no more than a few hours of assistance each year (Practical Applications of Research, March 1983).

Review of public school administrative priorities has revealed few cases where inservice education received a top rating when compared to other concerns. Even when staff development is accorded a high priority, as in a 1976 Ford Foundation study of six school districts, financial and staff allocations do not reflect this ideal (Harris, 1980).

3. Lack of Accountability. As suggested earlier, a primary reason that inservice education in school divisions tends to be fragmented is because often no single person has the basic responsibility for a coordinated approach. Since no individual is held accountable for program

success, quality tends to be quite variable (Toch, 1982; Williams, 1980). Content and approach are often determined by universities and outside consultants to meet credit and recertification requirements which are mandated by state department regulations and school district policies whether or not they meet teachers' immediate needs.

4. Need for Institutionalization. Koelling (1981) asserts that for inservice education to have substantial impact, it must be institutionalized into an actual system which provides formal avenues for planning, organization, financing, staffing and control. In order to provide necessary structure and substance, this system must be supported by long-term rationale, logic, and design. Finally, Koelling suggests the development and identification of institutional roles which would maximize both efficiency and accountability. Within such an arrangement, specific duties would be performed by local districts, state agencies, and institutions of higher education.

5. Roles in Inservice. Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975) suggest the need for a legal-organizational and budgetary support framework for inservice. Within this framework, the roles, responsibilities and interrelationships of involved agencies and individuals would be clearly established, particularly in terms of financial support and governance.

Issues to be addressed would include the role of teachers and teachers' organizations in inservice education. Will these groups be merely participants in the planning and execution of inservice programs, full partners in these activities, or actually in control of process and product? These same questions may be asked with reference to local school districts, state education agencies, and higher education institutions, particularly those with formal teacher training programs.

The National Council of States on Inservice Education (NCSIE, 1980) reported from its 1980 National Workshop that school districts are most heavily engaged in inservice activities (72 of 93 projects), but that intermediate school districts, and colleges and universities also design and implement programs. State departments of education have become increasingly involved in inservice policy development and implementation, and in a variety of inservice support roles, but rarely act as program organizers or operators. Johnson (1980) points out that one of the critical issues in inservice is how each group's stake and interest will be recognized in its local and state governance.

6. Funding for Inservice. Financial support is an area of crucial importance and the ultimate indicator of agency commitment to quality inservice education. As of November 1981, about three-fourths of the fifty states were spending state monies in addition to federal funds to support public school staff development (Collins, 1981). At that time, Florida was allocating $5 per FTE student to local districts to support Teacher Education Centers and district master plans for inservice education. Although Michigan paid $25-35 per professional staff member to local districts or consortia in 1979-80, those figures decreased to $16-23 in 1980-81. Ohio has allocated fifty cents per student to each district and its state legislature has established a categorical aid inservice program of $2 million for school districts, which is supposedly immune to the threat of later funding reductions. West Virginia has provided schools with $2,000 start-up grants and $1.90 per person-day devoted to district inservice programs (Collins, 1981;NCSIE, 1980; Johnson et al, 1982). These are only isolated examples of several states' recent funding commitments to teacher inservice education and staff development.

It must be emphasized, of course, that the allocations discussed above represent only direct expenditures for staff development. As reported in the March 1983 issue of Practical Applications of Research, Moore and Hyde (1978) document that the bulk of inservice funding is provided through the following "hidden costs":

1. Salary increments to teachers as a result of staff development activities.
2. Staff time to plan for the improvement of instruction and supervision of teachers.
3. Substitute teacher costs to release regular teachers for staff development activities.
4. Staff meetings.
5. Specific inservice days set aside by the district.
6. Released time associated with the opening of school in the fall.
7. Released time to serve on district inservice or staff development committees.
8. Support to attend professional meetings.
9. Released time during the academic year focused specifically on staff development (p. 3).

Although costs in these areas are seldom attributed directly to inservice activities, Moore and Hyde provide detailed formulae for approximating the total cost of staff development to an individual school division. In their research pertaining to three metropolitan school districts, these authors concluded that actual staff development costs were 50 to 60 times higher than those reflected in school division estimates and comprised as much as 3 to 6% of total operating budgets.

Although 1982 block grant legislation has given the states, and through them the local school divisions, control over the bulk of federal funds formerly available for staff development, most states continue to

consider direct allocations for inservice a low budget priority (Toch, 1982). However, a consensus has begun to develop that states should provide the leadership in inservice education due to their legal responsibilities and to the federal mandate requiring states to submit training plans in order to continue to receive federal funds (Johnson, 1980). Hobar and Gabrys (1981) maintain that it is particularly important, under block grants, that different state agencies do not set divergent goals which will result in competition for "a larger piece of an already small pie." They suggest that states requiring similar programs form networks to address common problems.

7. Statewide Plans and Collaborative Inservice Programs. Dr. James Collins, Director of the National Council of States on Inservice Education, reports that in 1981, 37 states had existing statewide inservice plans and that the remaining states were developing them (Ferver, 1981). Many of these were collaborative, often involving schools working directly with institutions of higher education (IHEs). The present trend toward collaborative inservice program planning and implementation is increasingly important as states develop more comprehensive approaches to teacher training and staff development. Johnson (1980) suggests that this emerging emphasis on collaboration may signify the beginnings of a legal-organizational framework for the governance of inservice education in which the roles of participating agencies will become more clearly defined. The general topic of collaboration in inservice education will be discussed in a later section on program integration.

8. Exemplary Approaches in Selected States. Johnson (1980), in discussing new approaches in inservice education, observes a tendency toward joint planning and away from unilateral control. This trend is

reflected in a variety of ways including consortia of two or more educational agencies, cooperation of several school districts or several colleges in the same geographical area, and teaming of large school districts with one or more colleges. Some schools and colleges are working with related public service institutions, and partnerships have been formed to include teacher organizations or communities as a whole in inservice planning.

Some noteworthy examples of these activities have occurred in Florida, where at least one Teacher Education Center per school district is planned, staffed, and financed jointly by one or more school districts and one or more colleges or universities. The Florida Department of Education approves those inservice opportunities offered through Teacher Education Centers which are housed in facilities owned or leased by the local education agencies (LEA's). Full-time state college and university staff are assigned to teacher centers when such assignments are requested by LEAs, and the state then reimburses these institutions for the services of their staff members. Each center has an advisory council consisting of not less than nine members, the majority of whom are teachers. A statewide council for Florida's Teacher Education Centers is composed of teachers as well as principals, school board members, superintendents, and representatives from IHEs and from the state education agency (Collins, 1981).

In California, the institutionalization of staff development involves teachers, administrators, county office personnel, and representatives of IHEs, teacher centers, and Teacher Corps. The efforts of these groups are coordinated to facilitate and encourage sharing of program successes, problems, and strategies (NCSIE, 1980). In Ohio, consortia of IHEs,

elementary and secondary schools, and citizens are developing, testing, and implementing improved teacher education curricula which emphasize clinical and field-based training (Rubin, 1978). Finally, in North Dakota, members of local advisory boards for teacher staff development include parents, students, and other nonprofessionals, as well as teachers, administrators, and board members (NCSIE, 1980).

9. Planning Inservice Change. Many states are taking action to remedy problems of fragmentation and lack of coordination in inservice education. The first step in this process, according to Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975), is consciousness-raising. The nature and importance of inservice education must be communicated if the public is to be willing to pay for it (Edelfelt, 1979).

Data must be accumulated which highlight individual programs' strengths and resources, and which include facts about existing and planned state and local staff development activities including formats and methods, evidence of outcomes, and breakdowns of cost-effectiveness. Particular attention should be devoted to areas where funding opportunities may be available and where small grants, in particular, would have far-reaching impacts. It is also important that proposed programs be closely related to state priorities and local needs (Edelfelt, 1979; Johnson et al, 1982).

Other Issues in Inservice Education

Inservice education is typically hindered by a number of problems of integration. These include balance between theory and practice, continuity between preservice and inservice, training for administrators as well as teachers, and collaboration between schools and universities in the development and implementation of programs.

1. Research and Theory/Practice. Collins (1981) states that inservice programs which are characterized by a balance between theory and practice have the most overall impact and the greatest appeal to participants, especially if these programs are school-based and job-embedded (as in on-the-job training). Although more money is currently being spent on courses in graduate schools of education than on any other kind of teacher staff development, very little is known about the impact of such courses on increasing teacher effectiveness (Howell, 1980).

Not only do public school divisions accord low priority to research and evaluation relating to inservice programs (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975), but that research which is undertaken often does not produce usable results. Toch (1982) observes that the effects of staff development on teacher performance or student achievement are rarely, if ever, reliably measured. Furthermore, he contends that administrators seldom bother to investigate whether inservice learning is being applied in the classroom. Houston (1980) observes that research findings, such as they are, are seldom addressed to improving inservice practices.

Research-based problem-solving strategies appear to be more effective than inservice programs based on unsupported ideas of what might work (Lezotte, 1982). However, if meaningful research is seldom accomplished, if research results are not being applied to programmatic change, and if it remains unproven that money spent on inservice produces tangible benefits, "professional growth activities will shortly be viewed as an unnecessary luxury or waste" (Rubin, 1979).

Thus, according to Rubin, some state departments have begun exploratory programs to promote practical testing of theory. Most of these

efforts are aimed at general professional improvement, however, rather than at specific problem areas.

2. Preservice-Inservice Continuum. According to Johnson (1980), there ought to be a closer relationship between preservice and inservice education. She contends that there should be a continuum between preservice and inservice which reflects an emphasis on particular competencies at each stage of teacher development.

The traditional pattern of teacher education includes three stages: a four-year preservice preparation period; a rather vague probationary period of approximately three years, and a period of inservice education which lasts for the remainder of one's teaching career. Edelfelt (1979) contends that there is now little connection among these stages and that there is almost no relationship between the nature of a school's organization and operation and the level of the school personnel's professional competence and experience. Teachers and administrators are expected to assume full professional roles and duties upon completion of academic training and certification. This policy is reflected in hiring practices, which seldom relate to candidates' qualifications beyond those of basic grade level and subject matter preparation (Edelfelt, 1979).

Collins (NCSIE, 1980) voices a prevalent opinion expressed in the literature that the sequence of teacher professional training should be redesigned to include a more defined induction phase of professional development. This would serve as a bridge between preservice preparation and the staff development activities which occur later in professional practice.

The importance of a preservice-inservice continuum, according to Collins (1981) is supported by the fact that, at the end of the typical

university-based teacher preparation program, eighty percent of graduates are still unable to apply their knowledge and skills effectively with students in the classroom. Collins suggests further that the proposed induction phase of teacher professional development should be collaboratively designed and administered by universities and public schools. It should provide for a protracted post baccalaureate period of study and practice within a collaboratively planned, administered, and supervised internship.

According to Collins (1981), between 85 and 90 percent of beginning teachers would be able to apply their preservice training successfully in public school classrooms if their induction periods were adequately designed to include provisions for a clinically supervised period of professional training with opportunities for direct, immediate, and continuous feedback; opportunities for student interns to plan for the future by reflecting on and critiquing their past experiences; planned, on-site, focused practice via micro-teaching or mini-teaching; and on-site coaching for each student intern.

Collins' proposal is supported by many in the field including Edelfelt (1979), who mentions other purposes and benefits of a preservice-inservice continuum. He states that an induction phase would give interning teachers time to develop their own teaching styles, to assume their professional teaching loads slowly and deliberately, and to function as parts of teaching teams. This period would also allow interns the opportunity to examine the school's personal and professional relationship patterns and reduce the pressure on the beginning teacher to conform immediately to the school's social system. Another purpose and benefit would be to assure and preserve a distinction between preservice and inservice education.

Finally, Edelfelt contends that a formalized continuum would prepare teachers for the various roles they must assume at different times, many of which cannot be learned before the teacher has had experience in a school setting. At various points in their careers, according to Edelfelt, teachers must fill at least eight related but separate roles, including individual professional, teacher of students, faculty member, staff member, liaison with parents, colleague of professional educators, teacher organization member, and member of the teacher profession. In addition, Ferver (1981) lists five "keys" which he says open the door to the continuum of preservice through retirement in professional education. These are collaboration, comprehensive teacher education centers for campus-based and field-based activities, induction training for beginning teachers, awareness of adult development, and career-long development plans.

A number of states have developed plans for coordinating state and federal funds for preservice and inservice training (NCSIE, 1980). Although the need for a preservice-inservice continuum is well documented, however, few programs have been developed which address this issue directly.

3. Administrator Training. According to NCSIE (1980), most inservice programs are directed at teachers, but in many cases administrators and other school personnel are included in staff development activities. Various programs have also been developed to address school and college faculty, principals, superintendents, college-based inservice educators, and citizens on community councils. These activities reflect the consensus that school improvement will not occur without inservice education for all professional staff (Johnson et al, 1982; Edelfelt, 1979).

A typical viewpoint is that effective school-based staff development programs must involve principals, both as instructional leaders and as

participants in inservice activities (Wood et al, 1982; Lezotte, 1982). Lezotte maintains that principals have traditionally been a major source of resistance to school improvement. This he attributes to the fact that most principals are uncomfortable in the role of instructional leader and do not function in this manner. Edelfelt and Lawrence (1975), in describing the state of the art in inservice, note a similar pattern with supervisors. Because they still are viewed as authorities who diagnose, prescribe, model, inspect, and rate, it is difficult for supervisors to see their primary responsibilities as helping, consulting, assisting, and supporting. Johnson (1980), however, cites studies which indicate that school-based inservice programs where supervisors or administrators help plan and conduct programs are more successful than those planned and implemented by college or other outside personnel without local supervisor or administrator involvement.

NCSIE (1980) highlights inservice programs relating to administrators' training in supervisory rather than management skills and other staff development activities which train administrators in needs assessment techniques. In addition, some state agency-sponsored inservice activities (in Kansas, in particular) have been designed specifically to strengthen administrator impact on school programs (NCSIE, 1980).

4. Collaborative Programs. McKenzie (1980) echoes the opinion of many professional educators that cooperative and creative partnerships, especially between school divisions and universities, are necessary to train teachers effectively. Collins (1981) asserts that the training profession should be an equal partner with the practicing profession in merging on-campus and field experiences for teachers.

In recent years, cooperative planning has become more evident in inservice design (Rubin, 1978), partially because of the expectation that school-university partnerships can enhance the quality of public school education during a period of declining enrollment and reduced fiscal resources (Cooper, 1981). Such collaborative relationships should have the following characteristics: acknowledgement of limited economic and human resources on both sides; a redefinition of the idea of expertise to value the contributions of both practitioners and academicians; clarification of mutual self-interest; "blame-free" examination of educational problems; and the design and implementation of creative programs which overcome traditional limitations and constraints within and between institutions (Cooper, 1981).

Schools of education (SCDEs) are specific targets for change efforts. According to King (1981), university departments of education must develop links with schools which do not interfere with teachers' control of inservice planning. According to Howey (1981), many IHEs and/or local school districts should initiate or increase programs for preparing school-focused teacher educators based upon existing knowledge in the areas of adult development, clinical supervision, organizational development, and teacher effectiveness.

King (1981) suggests that schools of education must examine the sociology of relationships between public school teachers and college professors in order better to understand problems related to inservice. Further study and data collection relating to teachers' specific needs and problems are also necessary. Finally, King suggests the need for internal structure changes in university education departments which would reflect SCDEs' desired shift in emphasis from preservice to inservice education.

One of the most important university structural changes related to improved quality of university involvement with public schools has been the appointment of faculty to work primarily with inservice programs and the establishment of offices for this purpose. This has already occurred at many institutions, where the inservice coordinator is typically a dean or holds a faculty appointment at the associate professor or professor level. In addition, many schools of education have off-campus centers with media equipment, resource libraries, computer access, and conference call capability (Seldin, 1981).

As the professional link between universities and schools, the inservice coordinator should assume four interrelated responsibilities:

1. Assess area resources and develop programs to prepare teachers and others to serve as inservice leaders at the district, and especially at the individual school level;

2. Serve as an inservice resource, providing expertise in the K-12 school curriculum and in generic approaches to promoting teacher growth;

3. Support interdisciplinary graduate emphasis in general teacher education or staff development, while piloting courses for key personnel in schools and faculty; and

4. Adapt conventional formats, such as workshops and courses, to be more responsive to site specific problems (Howey, 1981).

Various collaborative programs now exist which combine the resources and expertise of schools and universities. In some states formal consortia for staff development and inservice education have been established (Koll and Cozad, 1981). In others, (Wisconsin, for example) free short-term consultancy services are provided by university staff to school divisions needing assistance in leading and managing staff development programs and in acquiring inservice related resources (Koll and Cozad, 1981). In an

increasing number of universities, the majority of education faculty are sent into the field to teach both preservice and inservice courses and to have other direct dealings with teachers and public schools as part of their assigned professional responsibilities.

Allen (no date) discusses a number of reasons that more productive relationships between institutions involved in inservice education have not developed. In general, inter-institutional cooperation has not been viewed as advantageous either by school divisions or by universities. Attempts at inter-institutional planning are often regarded with suspicion and may be considered empire-building. Further, individual rewards are more directly tied to intra-institution activities. Allen also suggests that there has not been sufficient commitment to continuity in collaborative projects. Such projects must endure a longer decision-making process, since institutions have different levels of tolerance for risks and maintain varying criteria for evaluating the potential benefits of joint endeavors (Allen, Occasional Paper 2).

Elements Common to Successful Programs

The March 1983 issue of Practical Applications of Research states the essential question of inservice education as follows:

> Inservice education can come in many forms--self-study using programmed packages, group meetings, retreats, traditional classes. It can last an hour or continue indefinitely on a pre-arranged schedule. But whatever the form, or for however long, the basic question surrounding inservice education is not what it is but rather, "Is it effective?" (p.1).

Effective inservice, Practical Application of Research goes on to say, "accomplishes its goals; therefore, the goals should dictate the form of the inservice (length of time, materials, presenter, setting, etc.)." Thus, if the purpose of a particular inservice program is to

broaden awareness, present an overview, or introduce a concept, a one-day or "one-shot" session may be appropriate. If, on the other hand, the purpose is to integrate learning into an existing curriculum, then more in-depth training as well as appropriate follow-up will be required. For the most part, the following discussion will focus on inservice education with objectives which fall into the latter category.

1. General Features of Successful Inservice Programs. As a whole, existing literature on inservice education gives the impression that "the more successful programs treat their participants as people who want to continue to expand their skills and their range of professional competence" (Practical Applications of Research, March 1983). These programs also reflect careful planning to accommodate the design and methods of inservice to its participants and the effort to address participants' needs in the contexts in which they work.

In a widely cited 1981 study whose findings are similar to those reported by other researchers and planners, Gordon Lawrence indicates that inservice programs which most effectively address teachers' needs are those that:

-actively involve teachers in initiating, planning and conducting programs;

-are collectively designed by a school faculty to meet general faculty development rather than individual needs;

-have leaders linked with a university or other professional development center;

-use various program patterns emphasizing teacher responsibility, such as self-instruction, peer study groups, college courses, and one-to-one consultation;

-involve participants both in receiving new ideas and in putting them into practice, rather than in receptive roles to the exclusion of active roles, or vice-versa;

-include elements which could be tried out in classrooms or in simulations, in order that a novice may receive immediate feedback from a skilled person;

-include demonstrations of exemplary practices and provide participants with opportunities to learn skills by observing others;

-do not rely on lectures as the primary mode of delivery;

-are school-based if they emphasize affective or skill performance objectives;

-are scheduled not to conflict with participants' other professional obligations;

-permit school teachers and administrators to sponsor, design, and select leaders for inservice programs. (In general, programs led by teachers, school supervisors, and college staff have been judged more effective than those led by outside consultants, school district staff, or state department of education staff.)

The results of Lawrence's 1981 research, though similar to those of his earlier study in 1974, reveal some notable differences. Lawrence's 1974 findings, while stressing the utility of school-based programs, cast these in opposition to college-based or college-conducted programs (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975). By contrast, his 1981 conclusions favor the use of university-linked leaders for inservice programs. This deviation from the mainstream opinion reflected by Lawrence's own earlier conclusions is symbolic of the many contrasts and frequent contradictions which appear in the literature of inservice education.

An additional difference between Lawrence's 1974 and 1981 conclusions is the greater emphasis his 1974 study places upon the importance of individually (participant) selected rather than administrator pre-planned goals and activities, as well as upon self-initiated and self-directed programs for professional improvement. Another 1974 finding which is not reflected in Lawrence's 1981 study is the added effectiveness of programs

in which teachers help each other rather than working alone (Edelfelt and Lawrence, 1975).

2. Further Insights About Successful Programs. In addition to the general features of successful inservice programs described above, the literature reveals several crucial insights which need to be discussed in more depth. These will be addressed under three headings: importance of follow-up, team teaching as a mechanism for inservice, and the role of the principal. Much, though not all, of the material presented below is highlighted in the March 1983 issue of Practical Applications of Research where it is organized in a somewhat different fashion.

a. Importance of Follow-up. A necessary and increasing emphasis in inservice education has been the effort to determine how much of the content of inservice programs participants incorporate into their active teaching practice. An important study by Showers (1983) at the University of Oregon tests some of the hypotheses generated from research in this area. The results have strong implications which stress the importance of follow-up to the success of inservice programs:

> The (Showers) study confirmed that teachers can achieve skill in models of teaching that are new to them by studying theory, seeing it demonstrated a number of times, practicing and getting feedback from knowledgeable persons. However, unless coaching is incorporated--that is, unless either teachers, administrators, or trainers visit the teacher in the classroom quite a number of times following the training--little transfer of knowledge takes place (Practical Applications of Research, p. 2).

This statement speaks for itself. As indicated earlier, however, follow-up is one of the most frequently neglected elements of many inservice programs.

b. Team Teaching as a Mechanism for Inservice. A comprehensive study of team teaching by Gene Hall and his colleagues (1975) contains the interesting revelation that teachers do not view teaming as something whose purpose is primarily to benefit students. They tend to see it instead as serving an inservice function for themselves. Hall's contention is supported by other data and by observation. Teachers who work together in teams have the opportunity to model and to exchange ideas. They can also collaborate in the planning of teaching activities and provide helpful feedback to each other on the effectiveness of particular instructional practices. Team teaching is thus a very powerful form of continuing inservice education.

c. The Role of the Principal. As noted earlier in this paper, many school principals do not view themselves as instructional leaders, at least not nearly to the extent that they see themselves as school managers. As a result, the workshops and other training sessions that principals attend tend to focus primarily on accounting, evaluation, and other "pure" administrative tasks. On the other hand, research data reveal that "in those schools where implementation of new programs is most successful, principals take an active role in helping teachers with the technology or techniques of new instructional programs. In those schools where principals are less involved, implementation is less successful" (Practical Applications of Research, March 1983, p.3).

As Hall and others (1982) observe, principals have the opportunity to be change facilitators through a variety of "intervention" strategies which go beyond conventional seminars and workshops. These include casual conversations, observations, and suggestions which help teachers to improve their effectiveness.

3. Pointers for Practitioners. The March 1983 issue of Practical Applications of Research provides the following pointers for those planning inservice programs:

1. Plan inservice programs to accomodate identified staff needs for both short and long range.
2. Allow administrators and teachers to collaborate in planning inservice programs.
3. Involve the school principal in inservice programs.
4. Closely relate the activities of curriculum development, improvement of instruction, and inservice education.
5. Encourage the school board to make a professional and fiscal commitment to inservice education.
6. Specify objectives for all inservice activities.
7. Urge school districts to identify, develop, and use their own human resources to conduct inservice activities when possible.
8. Use staff incentives to encourage continued staff development.
9. Always evaluate inservice efforts.
10. Insist that inservice education be translated into classroom use to create an immediate impact on teaching and learning.
11. Don't insist that all school district personnel have the same training. (The relevance of an inservice activity may be inversely proportional to the number of participants.)
12. Use the local school building as the focus for inservice efforts.
13. Don't forget that inservice is a never-ending process in the improvement of schooling (p.4).

Conclusion

This paper has described the state of the art in inservice education, including existing problems and possibilities for constructive

change. It has suggested further that the importance accorded to teacher staff development, as compared to other public school and university priorities, remains uncertain.

When inservice education is consistently viewed as a legitimate and necessary part of teachers' work, as both a privilege and a responsibility of professional educators, its role will become firmly and clearly established. Until that time, however, its potential is still to be realized.

References

Allen, D. W. (no date). Merging resources of the IHE and the LEA for the improvement of inter-institutional study (Professional Development Occasional Paper 2). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Allen, D. W. (1980). Universities and schools for inservice education. In Providing Leadership for Staff Development and Inservice Education (pp. 21-28). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Baden, D. J. (1982). A user's guide to the evaluation of staff development. In F. J. McDonald, W. J. Popham and D. J. Baden, Assessing the Impact of Staff Development Programs (pp. 37-47). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Baden, D. J. (1982, November). Faculty Involvement in Inservice Education--Research and Teaching in a Teaching University. Paper presented at the national conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education. Atlanta, GA.

Blatt, B. (1980). The emporer would rather get it over with. In Providing Leadership for Staff Development and Inservice Education (pp. 15-20). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Christensen, J. and Migra, E. (1981). Implementation of a field-based master's program. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp.85-86). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Collins, J. F. (1981). Educational leadership in a changing world. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp. 1-13). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Collins, J. F. (1981). The state of the art in inservice education and staff development in state departments of education and the federal department of education. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15, 13-19.

Cooper, L. (1981). The institute of learning and teaching: a model for school-university collaboration. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp.51-53). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Drummond, W. H. (1980). Images. In Providing Leadership for Staff Development and Inservice Education (pp. 37-43). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Edelfelt. R. A. (1979, April). Inservice teacher education: a concept for overview. NSCIE Inservice (pp. 4-11, 15). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Edelfelt, R. A. and Lawrence, G. (1975). Inservice education: the state of the art. In R. A. Edelfelt and M. Johnson (Eds.), Rethinking Inservice Education. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association.

Ferver, J. C. (1981). Introduction to coordinating SCDE programs. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 15, 22-72.

Grossman, B. B. (1980, June). Assessing the impact of a training of trainers staff development manual in a California professional development center, NSCIE Inservice (pp. 17-19). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Gudridge, B. M. (1980). Teacher competency: problems and solutions. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Hall, G. E., Rutherford, W. L., and Griffin, T. H. (1982). Three change facilitator styles: some indicators and a proposed framework. (R & D report no. 3134) Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Hall, G. E., and Loucks, S. F. (1978). Teacher concerns as a basis for facilitating and personalizing staff development. Teachers College Record, 80 (1).

Hall, G. E., Loucks, S. F., Rutherford, W. L., and Newlove, B. W. (1975). Levels of use of the innovation: a framework for annalyzing innovation adoption. Journal of Teacher Education, 26 (1).

Harris, B. M. (1980). Improving staff performance through inservice education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Harris, B. M. (1980, June). A closer look at inservice design. NSCIE Inservice (pp. 22-24). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Havighurst, R. J. (1961). Developmental Tasks and Education. New York: David McKay Co.

Hobar, N. and Gabrys, R. (1981, November). Implications of block grants for personnel development. NCSIE Inservice (pp. 2,14-15). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Houston, W. R. (1980). The nature of change in schools and universities. In W. R. Houston and R. Pankratz (Eds.), Staff Development and Educational Change (pp. 4-10). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Howell, H. (1980). Pedagogy for chiefs. Adaptation of an address delivered at a meeting of the chief state school offices of the United States in White Sulfur Springs, West VA (Ford Foundation).

Howey, K. R. (1981). The concept of school focused inservice. In K. R. Howey, R. Bents, and D. Corrigan (Eds.), School Focused Inservice: Descriptions and Discussions (pp. 5-23). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Howey, K. R. (1981). Higher education for programming for inservice education. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education coordinators) (pp. 85-86). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Howey, K. R. and Bents, R. (1979, April). Alternative strategies for the delivery of inservice. NSCIE Inservice (pp. 27-28, 32-35). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Johnson, M. (1980). Inservice education: priority for the 80's. Syracuse, NY: National Council of State on Inservice Education.

Johnson, M., Andrews, T., and Edelfelt, R. (1982). Block grants and staff development. Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Jones, E. V. and Bolton, E. B. (1981). ABE inservice training: interrelating participant satisfaction and content gains. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 5 (1), 42-52.

Joyce, B. R., and Howey, K. R., Yarger, S. H., Hill, W. C., Waterman, F. A., Vance, B. A., Parker, D. W., and Baker, M. G. (1976). Issues to face. (Inservice Teacher Education Report 1). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching.

King, C. T. (1980). Schools and teachers collaborating with colleges of education on inservice and staff development issues. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp.6[illegible]75). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Knox, A. B. (1980). Continuing professional education for school teachers and administrators. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp. 41-48). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Koelling, C. H. (1980). Some fundamental considerations in inservice teacher education and professional development. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp. 59-63). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Koll, P. J. and Cozad, L. (1980). Organizing for inservice education/staff development in IHEs. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp. 57-58). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Larson, C. (1980). Effective programming: a fiscal model to enhance accountability and a reward structure for faculty. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs. (Proceedings of

the first national conference of college of education inservice coordinators) (pp. 33-35). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Lawrence, G. (1982, August). A synthesis of research on the effectiveness of staff development programs. NSCIE Inservice (p. 10). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Lezotte, L. (1982, August). Staff development and the research on effective schools. NSCIE Inservice (pp. 4,12,14). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Lorenz, J. A. (1982). Staff renewal. Chicago: Illinois Association for Supervisor and Curriculum Development.

Lumpkins, R. G., and Dubois, R. L., Palmaczer, R. A. and Johnson, E. (1980, April).Video inservice packages. NCSIE Inservice (p. 21). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Massey, S. A. (1979, April). Staff development: teaching adult professionals. NCSIE Inservice (pp.18-20). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

McKenzie, F. D. (1980). Staff development as a means of improving schools. In Providing Leadership for Staff Development and Inservice Education (pp. 44-49). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Moore, D. and Hyde, A. (1978). Rethinking staff development: a handbook for analyzing your program and its costs. New York, NY: The Ford Foundation .

National Inservice Network (1980, October). Quality practices task force final report. NCSIE Inservice (p. 21). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

NCSIE (1980). (See individual references listed under the following titles: (1) A picture of inservice education, (2) Professional development: the challenge of the 80's and (3) The states inservice in brief.)

Parramore, B. M. (1980, April). "Distance" inservice education for teachers using statewide television. NCSIE Inservice (p. 21). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

A picture of inservice education (1980). Providing Leadership for Staff Development and Inservice Education (pp. 52-57). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Practical Applications of Research (1983, March). (Newsletter of Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research--this issue devoted entirely to inservice education.) Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Center on Evaluation, Development and Research.

Professional development: the challenge of the 80's (1980, February). NCSIE Inservice (pp. 1-2,21). Syaracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Reynolds, W. and Howey, K. R. (1980). Reflections on adult development: implications for inservice education. In W. R. Houston and R. Pankratz (Eds.), Staff Development and Educational Change (pp. 25-52). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Rubin, L. (1978). Perspectives on preservice and inservice education. Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Rubin, L. (1979, April). Dissimination as inservice. NCSIE Inservice (pp. 16, 20-21). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Rubin, L. and Hansen, J. H. (1980). Assessing needs and prioritizing goals. In W. R. Houston and R. Pankratz (Eds.), Staff Development and Educational Change (pp. 105-124). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Selden, C. A. (1981). A national study of state universities and land grant colleges--off-campus inservice activities. In J. C. Ferver (Ed.), Coordinating College of Education Inservice Programs (Proceedings of the first national conference of college of education coordinators) (pp. 85-86). University of Wisconsin: Madison, WI.

Showers, B. (1983). Transfer of training: the contribution of coaching. Eugene, OR: The University of Oregon Center for Educational Policy and Management.

The states inservice in brief (1980, February). NCSIE Inservice (p. 4,5, 8, 15-21). Syracuse, NY: National Council of State on Inservice Education.

Stubblefield, H. W. (1974). Unpublished personal communication.

Terry, C. S. (1980, June). Using Multimedia. NCSIE Inservice (pp. 24-25). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Toch, T. (1982, September). Inservice efforts fail a system in need, critics say. Education Week, 2 (4), 10-11.

Warnat, W. I. (1979, April). A new dimension of adult learning: inservice education. NCSIE Inservice (pp. 22-24). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.

Williams, R. O. (1980, April). Project escape: a teacher designed inservice education program. NCSIE Inservice (pp. 22-23). Syracuse, NY: National Council of States on Inservice Education.